



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/779,881	02/18/2004	Yong-Kuk You	Q78875	9609
23373 7590 03/19/2008				
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC				
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.				
SUITE 800				
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
EXAMINER				
TESLOVICH, TAMARA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2137				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/19/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/779,881

Applicant(s)

YOU ET AL.

Examiner

Tamara Teslovich

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Remarks and Amendments filed December 11, 2007.

Claim 1 is cancelled.

Claims 2 and 9 are amended.

Claims 2-14 are pending and herein considered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 11, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's sole set of arguments concern the references' alleged failure to disclose or suggest "wherein the predetermined device identification information is generated by using N respective device identifiers for configuring the domain, wherein N is a whole number" as claimed by Applicant in claim 2. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant, drawing attention to paragraph 88 of the Yamamoto reference wherein "identification information of the devices that belong to the group" is used to create a "group ID" in order that it may identify numerous devices within a group. Yamamoto's "identification information of the devices" corresponds to Applicant's "predetermined device identification information," while his "group ID" is used for "configuring a domain" and includes "N respective device identifiers" as claimed by Applicant.

Applicant's arguments concerning claims 3 and 9 depend upon those given above with regards to claim 2 and are rejected for substantially the same reasons as given above.

Applicant's arguments concerning claims 4-8 and 10-14 rely upon the claims' dependence upon claims 3 and 9. Insofar as the Examiner maintains her rejection of the independent claims, those claims depending thereupon remain rejected as well.

It is for the reasons given above that the Examiner maintains the previously set forth 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 2-14, included below in an amended form to reflect Applicant's amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto et al. (US 2003/0084291 A1) in view of Messerges et al. (US 2002/0157002 A1).

Regarding **claims 2, 3 and 9**, Yamamoto discloses:

setting domain identification information into a predetermined device connected on one of a wired network and a wireless network and;

a third step of generating a predetermined first code value and transmitting a first packet encrypted with the first code value using the domain secret key generated in the second step (paragraph 0096, lines 1-5; paragraph 0097, lines 6-9);

a fourth of receiving a second packet that is encrypted with the first code value, which has been decrypted from the first encrypted packet using the domain secret key generated by another device (paragraph 108, lines 1-14; paragraph 109-, lines 1-7; paragraph);

a fifth step of decrypting the second packet received in the fourth step by using the domain secret key generated in the second step and determining whether a specific bit frame of the decrypted second packet is equal to the predetermined first code value generated in the third step (paragraph 0110, lines 6-14; paragraph 0111, lines 1-5; paragraph 0115, lines 1-20); exchanging said content after completion of said setting and generating operations (para. 0005 and 0012);

wherein the predetermined device identification information is generated by using N respective device identifiers for configuring a domain, wherein N is a whole number (paragraph 88).

Yamamoto does not disclose generating a domain secret key using the set of domain identification information.

Messerges discloses a domain secret key is generated by a domain ID and a device unique key (see abstract; paragraph 0036 and 0068). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Yamamoto to include the use of generating a domain secret key using set domain

identification information in order to link the domain ID to a user device, such that only users with appropriate domain secret key may be able to obtain content from the content server.

Regarding **claims 4-5 and 10-11**, Yamamoto discloses the method wherein the domain secret key is set as resultant value of a cryptographic one-way or hash function whose input variables are the domain identification information and the device identification information (one-way function is a property of a hash function, therefore, one-way function and hash function as claimed will be regarded as a hash function ((paragraph 0075, lines 4-6)).

Regarding **claims 6, and 12**, Yamamoto discloses the method wherein the first and second code values are predetermine bits random numbers generated by the devices themselves (paragraph 0096, lines 1-5; paragraph 0119, lines 1-9).

Regarding **claims 7-8 and 13-14**, Yamamoto discloses the method wherein the fifth step further comprises the step of generating a session key to be used for content encryption when the specific bit frame of the second decrypted packet is equal to the predetermined first code value generated in the third step (paragraph 0104, lines 1-5) or terminating a domain authentication process when the specific bit frame is not equal to the first code value (paragraph 0112, lines 5-14; paragraph 0107, lines 1-5; paragraph 0108, lines 1-7).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tamara Teslovich whose telephone number is (571)272-4241. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tamara Teslovich/
Examiner, Art Unit 2137

/Emmanuel L. Moise/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2137